## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
Plaintiff, ) v. )	Civil Action No. CV-75-S-666-S
JEFFERSON COUNTY, et al.,	
Defendants. )	
JOHN W. MARTIN, et al.,	
Plaintiffs, ) v. )	Civil Action No. CV-74-S-17-S
CITY OF BIRMINGHAM,  ALABAMA, et al.,	
Defendants. )	
ENSLEY BRANCH OF THE  N.A.A.C.P., et al.,	Civil Action No. CV-74-S-12-S
Plaintiffs ) v. )	
GEORGE SEIBELS, et al.,	
Defendants )	

# **JOINT STATUS REPORT**

Pursuant to this Court's Order at the status conference on October 31, 2013, counsel for the Martin-Bryant parties, the United States and Jefferson County, Alabama submit this joint report.

- 1. Following the conclusion of the October 31 meeting among the parties, the Receiver and his counsel, and the Special Master, the County undertook to take a first cut at identifying those jobs that may not need further attention as to the development of selection procedures in the near term. The Receiver requested that the County provide that list, together with projections as to the County's future hiring needs, by November 8.
- 2. On November 8, the County sent to the parties a chart of job classifications appearing on the Current Positions Semi-Annual Report as of October 15, 2013. The County's submission indicated that, of the 326 classifications currently represented in the County workforce, 292 may not need development of selection procedures at this time. The County also provided to the parties an assessment of its immediate workforce hiring needs in order of priority. The County's letter and enclosures are attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- 3. On November 15, the County sent the parties a proposed motion to approve an interim selection procedure for an Elections Coordinator. The Receiver and the Martin-Bryant parties separately informed the County on November 19

that they did not consent to the proposed motion. The County has not filed that motion.

- 4. On December 5, the Martin-Bryant parties wrote to the Receiver in response to the County's chart of job classifications. The Martin-Bryant parties identified 81 classifications of the 326 for which, in their view, the Receiver and parties can put aside for the time being, while continuing to work to winnow down and prioritize the remaining job classifications after receiving additional information from the Personnel Board and County. The Martin-Bryant parties' letter is attached hereto as Exhibit B.
- 5. On December 11, the parties conferred via telephone for almost three hours. Also participating in the conference were the Receiver and his counsel and staff, Dr. Veres, the County Manager, the Personnel Director and Deputy Director of the Personnel Board, and counsel for the Personnel Board. Dr. Sims advised the parties and Special Master that he is conferring with the County about his decision to retain Siena Consulting. Dr. Yusko, of Siena Consulting, will be speaking with the department heads about the positions in each department, a process expected to take a month or more. The Receiver's core staff is now in place.
- 6. The parties discussed the chart of job classifications provided by the County. The parties agreed that the 81 jobs identified by the Martin-Bryant parties in their December 5 letter do not need the Receiver's immediate attention.

- 7. The parties agreed that for the classifications requiring selection procedures in the near future, the Receiver and the County should evaluate each classification in light of the selection device used by the Personnel Board to determine whether the Board's selection procedures are adequate to the County's needs given the job, selection procedure and applicant pool. The parties contemplate that the I/O Psychologists retained by the Receiver will focus first on those jobs requiring County-specific selection procedures that have the greatest expected future hiring. The parties agreed that job families should be identified and evaluated together.
- 8. The parties also discussed at length the lines of communication going forward. Dr. Veres indicated that he will not communicate directly with the parties regarding substantive questions, but will be happy to facilitate communications amongst the parties and the Receiver. Dr. Sims stated that he will not communicate directly with attorneys for any party, and made clear that a request by a County Human Resources Department employee, such as Ms. Taylor, explicitly made at the Receiver's direction, is a request from the Receiver.
- 9. The parties discussed the County's requests for emergency hires. The Receiver indicated that he was prepared to assume all hiring responsibilities as contemplated in the Receiver Order (Doc. 1843), and that he would move the

Court to terminate the temporary orders. Thereafter, the County Manager will work directly with the Receiver regarding the County's current hiring needs.

10. On December 19, the Receiver filed an unopposed motion requesting that the Court terminate the temporary orders, which the Court granted the same day.

s/ Rowan D. Wilson
Rowan D. Wilson
Thomas G. Rafferty
Rachel M. Fritzler
Lauren M. Rosenberg

CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP Worldwide Plaza 825 Eighth Avenue New York, NY 10019 (212) 474-1000

s/ Jay D. Adelstein
Jay D. Adelstein
Joseph Sperber, IV

#### **OF COUNSEL:**

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE Employment Litigation Section – Civil Rights Division 950 Pennsylvania Avenue Washington, D.C. 20530 (202) 514-3749

## s/ David Smith

David Smith
Edward A. "Ted" Hosp
Janell M. Ahnert
Thomas J. Butler
Grace R. Murphy
Stephanie H. Mays

### **OF COUNSEL:**

MAYNARD, COOPER AND GALE, P.C. 1901 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue North 2400 Regions/Harbert Plaza Birmingham, AL 35203 (205) 254-1000

s/ Carol Sue Nelson

Carol Sue Nelson Theodore A. Lawson, II Attorneys for Jefferson County, Alabama

Jefferson County Attorney's Office 280 Jefferson County Courthouse 716 Richard Arrington, Jr. Blvd. N. Birmingham, AL 35203